



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/015,501	12/11/2001	Kerry Champion	23982-11568	6519
758	7590	02/13/2008	EXAMINER	
FENWICK & WEST LLP SILICON VALLEY CENTER 801 CALIFORNIA STREET MOUNTAIN VIEW, CA 94041			MIRZA, ADNAN M	
		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
		2145		
		MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE
		02/13/2008		PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/015,501	CHAMPION, KERRY
Examiner	Art Unit	
ADNAN M. MIRZA	2145	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 04 December 2007.
- 2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-56 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-56 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
- 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date, _____.
- 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 1-56 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gourraud (200200226473) and further in view of Arteaga et al (U.S. 2002/0161826).

As per claims 1,17,33,41-42,53-54,56 Gourraud disclosed traffic manager for facilitating communication between a client node and a server node in a distributed computing environment in accordance with at least one policy, the server node having a first interface associated therewith (Page. 5, Paragraph. 0054), the traffic manager capable of communicating with both the client code and the server node and comprising a central processing unit which is operable to: communicate with the server node via the first interface, generate and publish at least a second interface for communication with the first interface, in accordance with said at least one policy (Page. 4, Paragraph 0042). At least one policy mapping the first interface to the second interface (Page. 5, Paragraph. 0052);

However Gourraud did not disclose in detail communicate with the client node via the second interface, thereby allowing the client node to access at least one service on the server node in accordance with the at least one policy.

In the same field of endeavor Arteaga disclosed, If synchronous/online, a synchronous object is created from abSOAP.dll at step 1606. A SOAP Envelop is created from the object and sent as request to remote server at step 1608. At step 1610 a response is accessed the remote client application from the object (Page. 8, Paragraph. 0116).

It would have been obvious to one ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to have incorporated If synchronous/online, a synchronous object is created from abSOAP.dll at step 1606. A SOAP Envelop is created from the object and sent as request to remote server at step 1608. At step 1610 a response is accessed the remote client application from the object as taught by Arteaga in the method of Gourraud to provide a practical way for user communication devices to carry out real-time transactions and communications on such devices and processing of such transactions with a remote source such as an enterprise network server.

3. As per claims 2,18,34,43,55 Gourraud-Arteaga disclosed wherein the first and second interfaces comprises Simple Object Access Protocol (SOAP) interfaces (Arteaga, Page. 6, Paragraph. 0092).

4. As per claims 3,19 Gourraud-Arteaga disclosed wherein the SOAP interfaces employ Extensible Markup Language (XML) (Arteaga, Page. 6, Paragraph. 0092).

5. As per claims 4,20,35 Gourraud-Arteaga disclosed wherein each of the first and second interfaces has a description language file associated therewith defining the associated interface (Gourraud, Page. 8, Paragraph. 0076).

6. As per claims 5,21,36 Gourraud-Arteaga disclosed wherein the first interface corresponds to one of HTTP, TCP, HTTPS, HTTPR, and MQ (Gourraud, Page. 7, Paragraph. 0071).

7. As per claims 6,22 Gourraud-Arteaga disclosed wherein the distributed computing environment includes a network corresponding to a single enterprise including the server node, and wherein the client node is external to the network (Gourraud, Page. 7, Paragraph. 0071).

8. As per claims 7,23 Gourraud-Arteaga disclosed wherein the distributed computing environment includes a network corresponding to a single enterprise and including both the client and server nodes (Gourraud, Page. 7, Paragraph. 0066).

9. As per claims 8,24,40,44 Gourraud-Arteaga disclosed wherein the at least one policy includes requiring authorization by a human operator for invocation of the at least one service (Arteaga, Page. 7, Paragraph. 0107).

10. As per claims 9,25,41,45 Gourraud-Arteaga disclosed wherein the at least one policy includes 5 mapping an organizational role to a person (Arteaga, Page. 8, Paragraph. 0114).

11. As per claims 10,26,46 Gourraud-Arteaga disclosed wherein the mapping of the organizational role to the person is done using an LDAP directory associated with the distributed computing environment (Arteaga, Page. 4, Paragraph. 0060).
12. As per claims 11,27,37,47 Gourraud-Arteaga disclosed wherein the at least one policy is a security policy (Arteaga, Page. 7, Paragraph. 0107).
13. As per claims 12,28,48 Gourraud-Arteaga disclosed wherein the security policy is associated with encryption or decryption of at least a portion of data which is exchanged between the client and the server (Arteaga, Page. 7, Paragraph. 0107).
14. As per claims 13,29,49 Gourraud-Arteaga disclosed wherein the security policy is associated with generating or verifying at least one digital signature for at least one portion of data which is exchanged between the client and the server (Arteaga, Page. 7, Paragraph. 0107).
15. As per claims 14,30,38,50 Gourraud-Arteaga disclosed wherein the security policy is associated with protection against service attacks (Arteaga, Page. 7, Paragraph. 0107).
16. As per claims 15,31,39,51 Gourraud-Arteaga disclosed wherein the at least one policy is associated with enforcing policies with respect to publication or access to the first or second interfaces (Arteaga, Page. 7, Paragraph. 0107).

17. As per claims 16,32,40,52 Gourraud-Arteaga disclosed wherein the at least one policy is associated with review of data communicated between the server and client nodes (Gourraud, Page. 5, Paragraph. 0043).

18. As per claim 54 Gourraud-Arteaga disclosed a computer-implemented method for facilitating communication between server and client programs, the method comprising: reading a WSDL file associated with a first SOAP interface to at least one server program (Gourraud, Page. 5, Paragraph. 0052); and generating or publishing at least a second SOAP interface corresponding to the first SOAP interface in accordance with at least one policy; wherein at least one client program can use the second SOAP interface to request one or more services (Arteaga, Page. 1, Paragraph. 0009).

19. As per claim 55 Gourraud-Arteaga disclosed wherein the method further comprises: reading a first UDDI file which lists the first SOAP interface; generating or publishing a second WSDL file which describes the second SOAP interface; and creating or updating at least one UDDI entry associated with the generated or published WSDL file (Arteaga, Page. 6, Paragraph. 0095).

Response to Arguments

20 Applicant's arguments filed 12/04/2007 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Response to applicant's arguments is as follows. Claims 54 and 55 have been addressed.

A. Applicant argued that prior art did not disclose, "generate and publish at least a second interface, for communication with the first interface, in accordance with said at least one policy, the at least one policy mapping the first interface to the second interface".

As to applicants' argument Gourraud disclosed, "A method of converging telecommunication systems comprises sending by at least one network entity to a service node a networking protocol trigger that includes an application programming interface requirement. The application programming interface requirement requests an API response to the trigger. Depending on predetermined criteria, the service node responds to the network entity according to the networking protocol or the service node communicates with at least one application or with the network entity via the API (Page. 5, Paragraph. 0043). The API based applications are shown communicating with the call server and with the user profile database via the APIs and respectively. The APIs are used to allow the service manager to communicate with the call server (Page. 5, Paragraph. 0052).

B. Applicant argued that prior art did not disclose, “techniques for conduction online and offline transactions on different remote communication devices, such as handheld computers, PDAs or palmtops”.

As to applicant’s argument Arteaga disclosed, “enables real-time application to run on a remote communication device and to receive and store data through a resident web server and resident browser on the remote communication device. By enabling local communications between the resident server and resident browser, offline communications and real time applications can occur when the device is not connected to a desired network. When a network connection is established, a transaction and associated data can be transmitted (Page. 1, Paragraph. 0007)”. One ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention knows that remote communication devices are interrupted as smart hand held device.

C. Applicant argued that prior art did not disclose, “Traffic manager that can communicate with both the client and server node”.

As to applicant’s argument Arteaga disclosed, “Network web server 700 delivers applications, version updates, and necessary components via transfer protocol to a client device (Page. 6, Paragraph. 0090).

D. Applicant argued that examiner has not established a prima case of obviousness as a motivation or suggestion for combining Gourraud and Arteaga et al.

As to applicant's argument that there is no suggestion to combine the references, the examiner recognizes that obviousness can only be established by combining or modifying the teachings of the prior art to produce the claimed invention where there is some teaching, suggestion, or motivation to do so found either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one of ordinary skill in the art. See *In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071, 5 USPQ2d 1596 (Fed. Cir. 1988) and *In re Jones*, 958 F.2d 347, 21 USPQ2d 1941 (Fed. Cir. 1992). In this case, Arteaga in the method of Gourraud to provide a practical way for user communication devices to carry out real-time transactions and communications on such devices and processing of such transactions with a remote source such as an enterprise network server.

Conclusion

21. THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event,

however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

22. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communication from the examiner should be directed to Adnan Mirza whose telephone number is (571)-272-3885.

23. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday to Friday during normal business hours. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Jason Cardone can be reached on (571)-272-3933. The fax for this group is (703)-746-7239. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

24. Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for un published applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at (866)-217-9197 (toll-free).

/A. M. M./

Examiner, Art Unit 2145

Adnan Mirza

/Jason D Cardone/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2145